

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30767

**Title:** Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 00607640

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-19 15:39

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-02 18:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article reviews the application of cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging in the assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction. Overall, the review is well-written and the topic is important and suitable for the Journal.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30767

**Title:** Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 02633437

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-19 15:39

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-03 18:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ Y ] Grade A: Excellent	[ Y ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ Y ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ Y ] No	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review article, authors review the usefulness of cardiac magnetic resonance imaging in the assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction. This review article is well-written and suitable for publication to WJC. I demand no correction from authors.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30767

**Title:** Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 01277682

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-19 15:39

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-04 16:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article is well-written and very interesting. I demand no correction from authors.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30767

**Title:** Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 03498422

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-19 15:39

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-06 03:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors wrote an exhaustive review on the prognostic significance of CMR parameters in acute myocardial infarction, collecting and presenting the most important studies on this topic. Some minor comments: 1. Paragraph 1.2 I would specify if the studies mentioned were on patients treated or not with primary percutaneous revascularization. I would add some studies on the relationship between LV remodelling and medical/revascularization therapy. 2. Table 1. Please check the abbreviations used (for example, months = m or mths?). Same for the other tables. 3. Paragraph 3.2. I would revise the sentence "the area of LGE is a mixture of viable (oedematous) and necrotic cells and thus can overestimate true IS"; actually, this phenomenon is likely due to the oedematous (increased) interstitium, more than the oedematous cells (where Gd does not enter, if the cell membrane is intact); I would change the sentence into something like "the area of LGE detects not only necrotic cells, but also the increased (oedematous/inflamed) interstitium surrounding viable cells, and thus can overestimate true IS".

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30767

**Title:** Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging assessment of outcomes in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 00742221

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-10-19 15:39

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-07 00:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the article is very interesting and well written